may consider include: (1) the location where the relevant

agreements were negotiated and executed; (2) the state that is most

28

1 familiar with the governing law; (3) the plaintiff's choice of forum; (4) the respective parties' contacts with the forum; (5) the 3 contacts relating to plaintiff's cause of action in the chosen forum; (6) the differences in the cost of litigation in the two 4 5 forums; (7) the availability of compulsory process to compel 6 witnesses; and (8) the ease of access to sources of proof. Jones 7 v. GNC Franchising, Inc., 211 F.3d 495, 498-99 (9th Cir. 2000). 8 Mr. Campbell urges the court to transfer venue of this case to Spokane, Washington, citing the health needs of his ailing wife, 10 and the costs of litigating in a foreign jurisdiction. Mr. 11 Campbell provides no evidence or affidavit to support his claims. 12 Plaintiffs respond that a transfer of venue to Washington to remedy 13 the inconvenience to Mr. Campbell would only create inconvenience 14 for the other parties. Plaintiffs also claim that Mr. Campbell is 15 not the only caregiver for his wife. 16 The parties to this action are dispersed over several states,

The parties to this action are dispersed over several states, including California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, as are the relevant actions at issue, and the plaintiffs apparently selected Nevada because of its central location to the parties. Their choice should be accorded some deference.

Furthermore, there is no dispute that this court may properly entertain this suit in this district, as some of the actions alleged occurred in Nevada and two of the defendants reside here. In light of the number of parties involved in this case, some parties will unavoidably be inconvenienced wherever the case is adjudicated. In addition, Mr. Campbell is the only party currently named who resides in Washington. All parties, including Mr. Campbell, have retained counsel here. At this point, transfer of the case to Washington would therefore only create unnecessary

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

additional costs and delay. For all these reasons, the court denies Mr. Campbell's motion for change of venue. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: This 13th day of March, 2008. Howard DMEKiller UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Case 3:07-cv-00488-HDM-RAM Document 68 Filed 03/13/08 Page 3 of 3